

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were rejected in the recent Office Action. Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 18 and 19 have been amended to help distinguish from the cited prior art.

Claim 8 was objected to because of informalities. Claim 8 was amended as suggested by the Examiner. It is now asserted that Claim 8 is acceptable as to format.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Lachaud (GB 2149814). Claim 19 has been amended (according to page 4 of the specification, line 2) to have from 0.1 to 5 wt.% of the polymeric additive and (according to page 3 of the specification, line 24) to have a polymeric additive with a weight average molecular weight from 70,000 to 350,000. Lachaud specifies his thickener is present from 10 to 40 wt.% and his thickener has an average molecular weight of 1,000 to 27,000. In Lachaud, the thickener is probably present for the typical purposes of thickeners in lubricants (to increase the thickness of the lubricating layer of lubricant on a lubricated part). In the current application, the polymeric additive is to improve oil separation performance. Thus, it is reasonable that the molecular weights of the two additives would differ. Accordingly, it is alleged that claim 19 is distinguished from Lachaud.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 13, 16, and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Sakanoue (EP 1085077). The rejection seems to be based upon Sakanoue teaching a polyalkylene glycol additive of 800-2,000 molecular weight that is equated to the polymeric additive of the present claims. As the polymeric additive of independent claims 1, 18, and 19 has been amended to be 70,000-350,000, it is assumed that this rejection is no longer applicable.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 10-15, and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Lachaud (GB 2 149 814 A). This rejection seems to be based on the thickener of Lachaud being a 3,000 to 25,000 molecular weight polymer. As Applicants polymeric additive is now 70,000 to 350,000 molecular weight, it is assumed this rejection is no longer applicable.

Applicant includes with this response a petition for a two-month time extension.

Allowance of claims 1-19 is respectfully requested.

Applicant authorizes that any deficiency or overpayment of fees should be charged or credited to The Lubrizol Corporation Deposit Account No. 12-2275.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this amendment or the remarks made herein, a telephone call to the undersigned attorney would be welcome.

Enclosures: Request for a two-month time extension.

Respectfully submitted,

THE LUBRIZOL CORPORATION

/ Samuel Laferty /

Samuel B. Laferty, Ph.D.
Registration No. 31,537

The Lubrizol Corporation
Attn: Docket Clerk, Patent Dept.
29400 Lakeland Blvd.
Wickliffe, Ohio 44092
Telephone: (216) 447-5541
Facsimile: (216) 447-5933
E-mail: sbla@lubrizol.com